



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,055	02/17/2004	Yaniv Feinberg	60001.0308US01/MS305250.1	9688
27488	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			QUELER, ADAM M	
P.O. BOX 2903				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,055

Applicant(s)

FEINBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Adam M. Queler

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/23/2006 05/04/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed February 17, 2004, Response to Election / Restriction Filed 07/25/2007.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 20 and 22 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 7/25/2007 is acknowledged.
4. Claims 20 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 7/25/2007.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. **The information disclosure statement filed 8/23/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2)**, which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. **It also fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1)**, which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement. There is no attached PTO-1449 attached to the IDS. It

Art Unit: 2178

appears the only disclosure is intended to be the vague disclosure of a beta testing that may or may not involve the claimed subject matter. This does not constitute a proper disclosure and has not been considered. **Similar statements accompanying the IDS of 5/4/2006 have also not been considered.** They have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

7. **Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by “Unicode Standard Annex #9, The Bidirectional Algorithm” by Mark Davis.**

Regarding independent claim(s) 1, Davis teaches receiving a text selection containing text portions entered according to a plurality of spoken languages (English and Arabic, §2.1, para. 1). Davis teaches determining whether a text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display has been set (explicit, §2.1). As the claim(s) covers the alternative possibilities of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order. Davis teaches rendering the first portion of the text selection in the determined text reading order for rendering text according to the first spoken language (§3, bullet 2-3).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim(s) 2, all data in a computer is inherently stored at a memory location.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 3, Davis teaches that if a text reading order for rendering the text selection has been set, returning the set text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display (§ 3 rendering based on the settings, which include the order, §2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 4, as per claim 3 Davis teaches the text is rendered correctly. Inherently, the order must have been returned.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, Davis teaches a LTR reading order (§2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, Davis teaches a RTL reading order (§2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 7-10, as the claim(s) covers the alternative possibilities of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 2178

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 11-19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 11, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the proper alignment before rendering the selection, so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 12, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the proper alignment and returning it to the renderer, so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 13, as the claims covers the alternative possibilities of having a text alignment set and a text alignment not being set, since the above combination determines that it is set, limitations involving what happens if the alignment is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by finding the set alignment.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 14, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2178

invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding independent claim(s) 22, Davis teaches receiving a text selection containing text portions entered according to a plurality of spoken languages (English and Arabic, §2.1, para. 1). Davis teaches determining whether a text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display has been set (explicit, §2.1). As the claim(s) covers the alternative possibilities of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order. Davis teaches rendering the first portion of the text selection in the determined text reading order for rendering text according to the first spoken language (§3, bullet 2-3).

Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 15, 23, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order. Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order (§2.1). Inherently, this includes determining the correct order.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 16, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order. Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order (§2.1)

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim(s) 17, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 18, 19, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended, including left and right alignment.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 24, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order. Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order (§2.1). Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Queler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4140.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

aq


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER